What is the management-oriented approach to evaluation?

* Goal of this approach is to garner information in such a way that can inform decision makers (managers) in order to make informed decisions
* This method relies on a systems approach, similar to the logic model – input, processes and outputs
* This evaluation framework looks at the decision that managers must make, not the objectives as the central tenant of the evaluation outcome
* Evaluation is structured to ‘help administrators make good decisions’ (Fitzpatrick, Sanders & Worthen, 2004, p. 89).
* According to the authors, management-oriented evaluation not only focuses on decision making (formative) but also accountability (summative)

What is the CIPP model and how does it fulfill the goal of providing information to improve decision-making?

* Stufflebean (as cited in Fitzpatrick, *et al*., 2004, p. 89) sees evaluation as “the process of delineating, obtaining, and providing useful information for judging decision alternatives.”
* CIPP model provides a framework for managers/administrators to make 4 different kinds of decisions:
  1. Context evaluation – meant to serve planning decisions
     + Determine the needs to be addressed by a program
     + Looks at what programs that already exist to define objectives for the program
  2. Input evaluation – serve structuring decisions
     + Looks at determining the availability of resources, reflecting on alternate strategies, and how best to meet needs
  3. Process evaluation – implementing decisions
     + Asks questions about the program being implemented; e.g. – how well is program being implemented; what are barriers to success.
     + Once questions are answered procedures can be refined and improved
  4. Product evaluation – recycling decisions
     + Used to judge program attainment.
* Within each of the above – there is a list of steps that evaluator should follow:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1. Focus the evaluation 2. Collection of information 3. Organization of information | 1. Analysis of information 2. Reporting of information 3. Administration of information |

* It appears that in garnering the required information from the CIPP process, as an evaluator we need to determine which one of the decisions we are making, and then used the steps developed by Stufflebeam to guide us in the evaluation process
* Stufflebeam provides us with a structured means of narrowing down the goal of determining what it is we are trying to evaluate, while providing guidelines to walk through the process. As someone new to the evaluation process, I find it very helpful to have a structured step-by-step process to use while I work my way through the learning curve.

What is the UCLA evaluation model? (pg 92 if I want to include)

* The UCLA model has some similarity to the CIPP model (systems assessment/context evaluation; programming planning/input evaluation; program improvement/process evaluation; and, program certification/product evaluation).
* Two things that I found of particular interest in this model was the use of the term ‘program certification’ – this caught my eye given the connotation of a program being certified, and what that means. I also think the addition of the program implementation step is of value, as it gives us the opportunity to ensure that programming we are doing is focused on the right group.

What are some of the main strengths and limitations of the management-oriented approach?

* Gives us a mechanism to determine what information to collect thereby allowing the evaluator to focus specifically on what is needed to inform decision-making, rather than just asking a broad range of questions that are likely unnecessary in their scope. As noted by Fitzpatrick, *et al*., “connecting decision-making and evaluation underscores the very purpose of evaluation” (p. 95).
* Questions the evaluator should ask may clash with the information the decision-makers require.
* Concern that evaluation becomes vested in the desires of ‘upper management’ thereby ignoring those stakeholders that should have input to the process.
* This form of evaluation can be complex and costly, to the extent that it takes away required resources from the program itself.

What are consumer-oriented approaches to evaluation?

* Because of the increased competition in the field of human services products, evaluators have deemed it important to understand what the best interests of the clients are.
* The focus of this approach tends to be summative; however through the use of checklists and criteria using a consumer advocate during the production process, it has a formative element as well.

What are the components of Scriven’s checklist?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1. Need 2. Market 3. Performance – true field trials 4. Performance – true customer 5. Performance - critical comparisons 6. Performance – long term 7. Performance – side effects | 1. Performance – process 2. Performance – causation 3. Performance – statistical significance 4. Performance – educational significance 5. Cost-effectiveness 6. Extended support |

* While it is unlikely than any product in the market would be judged successfully in all the above criteria, those that strive to meet these standards improve the efforts of the product developers

How could the consumer-oriented model be used?

* I find the notion that this approach was used by a centralized agency it would be an ideal way to inform and protect consumers.
* Important questions on a product could be determined, such as process information, content information, transportability information, and effectiveness information,

What are some of the strengths and limitations of this approach?

* Has provided information from evaluations to those that may not have the time to, and increased consumer knowledge about the criteria to use in their selection process.
* On the downside, this process can increase the price of products; creatively may be quelled because of the standards established around product development

**Part 2**

In contemplating the chapters just reviewed, I found the CIPP model of particular interest. The following quote from Fitzpatrick *et al.,* (2004) seems to encompass the evaluation approach that I, as a decision-maker feel that would best answer questions needed to make an informed decision. The authors comment:

The management oriented approach supports evaluation of every component of the program as it operates, grows, or changes. It stresses the timely use of feedback by decision-makers so that the program is not left to flounder or proceed unaffected by updated knowledge about needs, resources, new developments, the realities of day-to-day operations, or the consequences of program interventions. (Fitzpatrick *et al.,* 2004, p. 95)

These comments reflect many of the concerns I have had in terms of what we do as a college, and the CIPP model seems to provide a holistic approach to review or evaluate much of what we do. I feel that we do flounder as an organization in terms of the programming decisions we make, or don’t make. What is even more attractive about this approach is that not only is it formative, it also encompasses the summative orientation thereby providing accountability. The notion that this process does not necessarily have to be included from the outset, especially where programming has been in place for some time, allows decision-makers to gain information about the program to assess where improvements can be made, and thereby budget accordingly.

So, I have identified an evaluation process, or at least I think I have, from which I can start to inform my decision-making process. Perfect...right?! Well not so fast; what does this really mean for me in terms of ‘do-ability?’ Given that I am very new to this notion of including evaluation into programming, I find it helpful to have a structured list of what to do. For me, it is, “Okay, now that I know that evaluation is a fundamental aspect of what I do as an administrator, show me how to do it!” In the textbook, while discussing the consumer oriented approach the authors direct us to the following website: [www.wmich.edu/evalctr/checklists](http://www.wmich.edu/evalctr/checklists) (if you haven’t done so already I would suggest you take a tour) to view Scriven’s **Key Evaluation Checklist.** In viewing the site I found a plethora of useful information and samples of various checklists, one if which was Scrinven’s (2007) checklist on the CIPP model. In reviewing the letters in the acronym of CIPP, Scriven (2007) further breaks down, or in my case ‘dumbs’ down the questions that this model is truly seeking. Respectively, they ask, “What needs to be done?; How should it be done?; Is it being done?; and, Did it succeed? “(Scriven, 2007). This certainly encapsulates what I want, and need to know. Stufflebeam, McKee and McKee (2003) also provide a guide to better understanding the process for use of the CIPP model of evaluation. Stufflebeam, *et al*., (2003), acknowledges that this model, while being both formative and summative, also is an ideal tool to be used by those engaging in internal evaluation. This is ideal...it becomes a real tool that I can use.

So between the CIPP checklist (Scriven, 2003), Stufflebeam, et. al.,(2003) document, and the information garnered from the textbook; particularly Stufflebeam’s (as cited in Fitzpatrick *et al.,* 2004) list of general steps to inform the evaluator, and the information found in Table 5.1 (p. 91) I feel that I could sit down and begin to have a firm starting point in which to begin the process of including evaluation in what we do.
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